



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,416	04/21/2004	Nobuhiro Nakamura	252144US-2 CONT	4529
22850	7590	01/11/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			GUHARAY, KARABI	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2889		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/11/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,416	NAKAMURA, NOBUHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karabi Guharay	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment, filed on 10/22/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12, 14-28 and 30-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12, 14-28 and 30-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Amendment, filed on 10/22/2007 has been considered and entered.

Claims 1, 11 and 30 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14-18 and 21-28, 30-32, 34,37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagayama (JP 2000-243558), and further in view of Iyama (JP 09-138424).

Regarding claims 1-4, 10-11,14-16, 21, 30-32, Nagayama teaches an organic EL (Fig 1-3 & 5) display element comprising a first conductive layer (9), a second a second conductive layer (5), made of transparent ITO, opposed to the first conductive layer 9, an insulating layer covering edge portions of the second conductive layer 5 (see paragraph 13) a driving current circuit (see paragraph 0003) connecting terminal connected electrically with the first electrode (9) via supplementary wire (16), and an organic EL layer (7) disposed between first and second conductive layer, such that the organic layer only contacts a central portion of the of a surface of the second conductive layer and does not contact the edge portions of the second conductor 5 (see Figs 6 & 8, where the edges of the anode 5 is not covered by organic EL layer 7, only the central portion of anode 5 is contacting organic EL layer 7; also see paragraph 13); wherein the

supplementary layer has at least has one surface layer containing Mo alloy (see paragraph 9), where the second conductive layer (5) is made of a same material (ITO) as the driving current circuit connecting terminal (15 is also made of ITO).

But Nagayama is silent about the supplemental wire (16) has a different composition from the remainder of the supplemental wire or supplemental wire comprises at least 3 layers including a layer containing Mo alloy, and a layer of Al or Al alloy formed below the Mo layer.

However, in the same field of display device, Iyama discloses wiring pattern for driving a display having a metal electrode comprising at least 3 layers (17, 18 & 19 of Fig 2f) first and third metal thin film layer made of Mo (17 & 19), a layer (18) of Al or Al alloy (second metal thin film layer) formed below the layer of Mo, on the transparent layer (16). Further Iyama teaches that such type of multilayer wiring extremely lower the occurrence rate of display defect by preventing erosion of transparent and metallic thin film electrode, (see English Abstract).

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a Al alloy layer under the Mo alloy layer as the supplemental wire on the transparent layer (15) of the Nagayama's device since this will significantly prevent erosion of transparent electrode and metal thin film.

Regarding claims 5 & 17, Nagayama discloses that the first conductive layer (9) is connected to an etched surface of the layer containing Mo alloy (paragraph 13).

Regarding claims 6 & 18, Nagayama discloses that a portion of the first conductive layer (9) connected to the layer containing Mo is defined by an insulating film (see paragraph 13).

Regarding claims 12 & 22, Nagayama discloses an organic EL display device and a driving circuit for driving EL element (though circuit is not shown in drawing it is connected to 11 for driving the display).

Regarding claims 23 & 26, Nagayama discloses an organic electroluminescent device comprising several pixels (see Fig 1) having several supplemental wires, however, does not disclose the number of wires, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have at least 30 supplemental wires to form a large display.

Regarding claims 24 & 27, Nagayama discloses a passive matrix EL display and discloses that the electrode leading part 11 is made of high melting point metal (paragraph 9), and further teaches in paragraph [0003] that large current is flowing through the conductors via supplemental wire (11) so low resistance material is chosen, thus it is configured to carry a driving current of at least 50 mA of current.

Regarding claims 25 & 28, Nagayama discloses that the material of the one surface layer is a two-component alloy (paragraph 9).

Regarding claims 34, 37 & 40, Nagayama discloses that the Mo alloy is a two component system including Mo and W (paragraph 9).

Claims 7,8, 19-20, 33, 35-36, 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagayama, and Iyama as applied to claims 1-4, 11, & 30, in view of Codama et al. (U.S. 6,114,805).

Regarding claims 7 & 19, Nagayama teaches all of the limitations of claim 7, but fails to teach that the Mo alloy contains Nb.

Codama et al. in the analogous ad teaches wherein the Mo alloy contains Nb (col. 8 lines 39-47; col. 8 line 30). Additionally, Codama et al. teaches incorporation of such a Mo alloy contains Nb, where content of Nb in the alloy is about 10 at %alloy to improve the thin film resistance of interconnection electrode (col. 8, lines 30-50) and provide a working interconnection electrode.

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use wherein the Mo alloy contains Nb in the auxiliary electrode of Hosokawa, since such a modification would improve the thin film resistance of interconnection electrode and provide a working interconnection electrode as taught by Codama et al.

Regarding claims 8 & 20, Codama discloses wherein the content of Nb in the Mo alloy is 5 to 20 at %. This claim is rejected for the same reasons found in claim 7.

Regarding claims 33, 35, 36, 38 and 39, Nagayama and Iyama teach all the limitations of claims 33, 35, 36, 38-39, except for the claimed range of thickness of Mo alloy layer and the Al or Al alloy layer.

However, Codama specifically teaches that the protective layers in the interconnections should have thickness in the range of 100-500 nm in order to have optimum protection (lines 50-67 of column 8).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have layers in the range of 100-500nm as taught by Codama in the combined structure of Nagayama & Iyama since such range of thickness of protecting layers will provide optimum protection.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/22/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Nagayama does not teach or suggest that light emitting layer 7 only contacts a central portion of a surface of anode 5 and does not contact the edge portions of the anode plate.

However, examiner respectfully differs. Nagayama explicitly teaches that at the edge portion of the transparent electrode 5, an insulating layer is formed between the transparent electrode 5 and the luminous layer 7 (see paragraph 13), thus organic layer 7 does not contact the edge portion of the second electrode (anode 5).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karabi Guharay whose telephone number is 571-272-2452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

K. Guharay
Karabi Guharay
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879

01/02/08